DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 407 032 JC 970 236

AUTHOR	Gibson-Benninger, Barbara S.
TITLE	A State without a System: Historical Analysis of Pennsylvania Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	[97]
NOTE	35p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; College Administration; *Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; *Geographic Location; *Governing Boards; Institutional Mission; Organizational Objectives; *State Boards of Education; *State Regulation; *State School District Relationship; Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Compared to the organization of two-year education in other states, Pennsylvania can be said to have a "non-system" in which local determination predominates and state planning and coordination agencies are little more than advisory bodies. California, for example, has a much larger and more regulated system than Pennsylvania, with the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges coordinating 107 public and private institutions. New York's community colleges are well organized in a hierarchical state system, while Texas maintains a well-defined 2+2+2 system. Florida and Illinois also differ from Pennsylvania through the existence of a central governing board for community colleges, while Ohio and Michigan differ in that colleges are planned to be geographically accessible by all residents. In Pennsylvania, however, two-year institutions are not strategically located in terms of geography or population; individual institutions report to their local board of trustees, rather than the central state body; and the two-year schools actually began before passage of the state's Community College Act in 1963, with many branch campuses originally separate from their main campuses. The organization of five of the first community colleges in the state, initiated by local counties and based on local support, illustrate the problems of the decentralized system. As the colleges were formed, two lawsuits were filed by residents in separate counties to block their establishment and resulting relations between institutions have been competitive and confusing. Contains 35 references. (HAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A State Without a System: Historical Analysis of Pennsylvania Community Colleges

ED 407 032

Barbara S. Gibson-Benninger

Pennsylvania State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. S. Gibson-Benninger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JC 970 236

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A State Without a System:
Historical Analysis of Pennsylvania Community Colleges

Barbara S. Gibson-Benninger
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

INTRODUCTION

During the 1960s, national interest in community colleges roused states into action. In 1960, the President's Commission on National Goals maintained the need for the availability of two-year colleges within close proximity of all high school graduates (Palinchak, 1973, p. 125). States were charged with meeting this need in their own way, therefore the history of community colleges in each state is a unique story. Compared to the organization and systems of other states, Pennsylvania's system of two-year higher education is not a 'system' at all, but a collection of institutions operating as community colleges and branch campuses.

Pennsylvania had an opportunity to establish statewide coordination with the passage of the Pennsylvania Community College Act of 1963. The establishment of the 13 institutions currently operating is partially a result of this piece of legislation. But why did some localities embrace the opportunity to found community colleges and some not? Why are there areas in the state where there are currently no community colleges? Why do branch campuses of state-related universities (The Pennsylvania State University, The University of Pittsburgh, and Temple University) offer similar programs at their sites, seemingly in direct competition with the community colleges?

It is the work of a state system of higher education to answer these questions. State systems have consolidated governance over higher education institutions and have enacted policies that apply to all levels and types of institutions. Bender (1994) gives examples of systems under boards of regents and others governed as university systems. He cites Pennsylvania as an example of a "non-system," a state "where local determination predominates as a result of little or no system authority at the state level" (p. 165), and "where state planning and coordinating agencies are little more than advisory bodies" (p. 166). This lack of authority has resulted in the confusing condition of two-year education in Pennsylvania. Palinchak says, "The community college and the university branch extension are different in purpose and function and do not work well together. Poor coordination at the state level is often due to political influence beyond the reach of any formal plan" (pp. 144-145). The situation in Pennsylvania raises many questions. How did this "non-system" come about? What forces dominated decisions to establish two-year institutions? What were the costs and benefits of this arrangement when it was established? What modifications may be made today?

Higher education is evolving and changing to meet the needs of the society it serves. Institutions which offer two-year education, in particular, are able to respond and change quickly to local and regional educational needs. Understanding the history of these institutions allows us to make more informed decisions about what their future contribution to a state's investment in postsecondary education might be and what directions they may most effectively take today. Practioners in both the institutions and

in the government might use this understanding of the past to appreciate the inertia in the system and make informed policy decisions (Cohen, 1996).

DIFFERENCES IN STATE SYSTEMS

Although all states tend to have similar goals and responsibilities, there are significant differences in state systems. One revealing example of this is the varying systems of community colleges which exist in the United States. Now, in the 1990s, state systems are as individual and unique as fingerprints. Louis Bender (1994) describes the predicament well, saying:

> No two states can be described as the same; yet, researchers, policymakers, and the national and local press continue to promulgate national norms, generalizations, and claims that mislead or deceive because they assume uniformity. Size, geography, economy, and demographics, as well as dissimilar education governance structures, are important determiners of each state's postsecondary education delivery systems and their relationships. The individual differences of each state cannot be overemphasized (p. 165).

Researchers from The California Higher Education Policy Center and at the Arizona State University defined a state system of higher education as: "a collection of subsystems that takes one or more kinds of inputs and creates an output that is of value to the larger system of which it is in turn a part," and further defined a sub-system of higher education as being "comprised of institutions or groupings of institutions overseen by a governing board" (Callen, Bracco, Finney, Martinez, Penley, & Richardson, 1996, p.1). These systems began individually and therefore have peculiar and unique characteristics that were meant to serve their individual states.

Through various approaches in legislation, some states recognized two-year schools as a part of higher education while others considered it part of the upward extension of high school education. Plans were made providing for junior colleges, community colleges, and branch campuses of state colleges and universities without consideration of their relationships to other institutions and without coordination with other states (Palinchak, 1973). During the 1960s the community college movement advanced all across the nation. Other changes in higher education happened concurrently --- including an extension of science into new areas, the expansion of medical schools, the movement of state teacher's schools (normal schools) to comprehensive four-year schools, and the spread of the idea that college was for everyone. Palinchak (1973) reflects upon the legislation concerning community colleges and says that "Each state handled the matter in its own time and manner, which brought further frustration to those who thought they saw the diversified activity as a "movement"" (p. 78). Many changes were occurring, but the changes were not directly related --- and certainly not coordinated --- into any organized plan or group goal one thinks of in terms of a "movement."

To illustrate differences and similarities between and among states, those eight states largest in population are examined in more detail in the following sections, particularly in regard to two-year postsecondary education. A summary of the histories of these statewide systems, as well as overviews of how they operate today, are provided.

California

The California system is one of the most diverse and yet most easily understood of all the state systems. California began interest in public junior colleges in 1910 and now operates 106 public community colleges in 17 districts. In California, anyone 18 years of age or older who desires to go to college may do so --- if not at a four-year college or university, then at a community college. Anyone may begin their education at a local community college, then transfer to another type of institution when they are academically prepared. These community colleges not only prepare students for transfer, but for technical and professional occupations as well. In addition to the degree and certificate programs in transfer and occupational education the California community colleges also provide remedial instruction, instruction in English as a second language, basic adult education, employment training, and programs for older adults, immigrants, parents, the handicapped, and the community (Fountain & Tollefson, 1989, p. 14).

The first state legislation assuring the existence of the two-year postsecondary institution was the Caminetti Law introduced in 1907 and authorizing the upward extension of high schools. Its purpose was to provide a method of entry for students living far from state high schools to matriculate to college by enabling high schools to offer a two-year postgraduate course. The Ballard Act, introduced in 1917, detailed financial arrangements and limited junior college courses to two-year programs. The Deering Act was the first actual junior college legislation in California, differentiating the junior college from the high school. Passed in 1921, it provided for three types of junior

college districts: those with the same boundaries as a school district, those consisting of a combination of two or more school districts, and those with the same boundaries as a county.

This Act explained the organization and governance of these districts, established the financial support of districts, outlined the standards and purposes of the junior college, set a low-end limit for enrollment and explained procedures for discontinuance, stipulated where out-of-district tuition should come from, and established a junior college fund (Reid, 1966, p. 246). By 1926, 31 junior colleges were in existence. Rather than expanding two-year institutions to four-year institutions, a report commissioned by the California legislature in 1947 recommended expansion of the three tiers of higher education in California as a way to accommodate the increase in enrollment after World War II. This document was "A Report on a Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education, 1948," also known as the Strayer Report. Enrollments continued to rise and another report, "A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education" examined the needs of the state in terms of higher education and governance. The result of discussions generated by the report was an increase in the number of community colleges and the delineation of functions among the three tiers of higher education in the state including agreed upon achievement requirements for transfer students. California became the first state to implement a master plan for higher education. The California community college system was considered a part of the state's public school system, making one case for higher education in the state to be tuition-free. California community colleges are known for being within easy access

of all of the population, open door access, the success of the tripartie system, fully-developed student services, and fast response to local community needs.

In 1960, California published a master plan designating junior colleges as an official part of higher education. Legally the name of these institutions was "community" colleges rather than "junior" because junior implied a lesser degree of college rigor than "community," and in order for the three tiers to function effectively the institutions needed to have equal status (Palinchak, 1973).

The California Postsecondary Commission assumed the responsibilities of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in 1974. It is an appointed board which advises the legislature, governor, and postsecondary institutions about matters such as budget issues, the location of new campuses, and new programs. California also has institutional governing boards for groups of similar institutions. 71 local boards govern the 107 public two-year colleges and are coordinated by the Board of Governors of the California Community College. The California Association of Community Colleges includes public and private institutions, but public institutions dominate both in total numbers of schools and in orientation of the organization (McGuinness & Paulson, 1990).

California's tiered system is more prescribed than Pennsylvania's. Legislation about two-year postsecondary education has a long history, from the 1907 Caminetti Law to the first Master Plan for higher education. Both public and private institutions comprise the 107 colleges coordinated by the Board of Governors --- a much larger and regulated system than exists in Pennsylvania.

New York

Established in 1784, the Regents of the University of the State of New York are responsible for setting and implementing policy for all educational endeavors in the state. Elementary, secondary, and postsecondary educational institutions along with libraries, museums, and other educational agencies are part of the University of the State of New York. The responsibilities of the Regents include chartering, registering, and inspecting all educational institutions; licensing professionals, certifying teachers and librarians; administering the budget to these institutions; and supervising the master plan. This supervisory board is elected by the legislature. Two public institutional governing boards --- the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York, and the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York --- operate under the Regents (McGuinness & Paulson, 1990).

The State University of New York (SUNY) community college system is comprised of 30 institutions offering transfer, vocational, continuing, and developmental education. In 1945 New York issued a "Plan for Post War Education in the State of New York" to create 22 new institutions combining general and technical education. Citizens at the time were interested in a system of state universities. In 1948 the Temporary Commission on the Need for a State University suggested not only a state university plan, but the establishment of community colleges. The idea was an immediate success and by 1957 there were 11 community colleges in New York (Fountain & Tollefson, 1989, p. 150).

In 1964, legislators developed a statewide plan abolishing the establishment of new public four-year community colleges, assuring the community colleges of New York be separate from both secondary education, and four-year schools. Through the 1960s and early 1970s these institutions continued to propagate and grow to meet the demands of the state. The establishment of the community college system was one of the last in the nation, but the growth and success of the New York system has been brisk. They boast both curricular and geographical accessibility.

New York, like California but unlike Pennsylvania, includes its community colleges in an organized and hierarchical state system. Like Pennsylvania, New York relied on private colleges and universities to educate citizens until social demand necessitated the establishment of a different type of institution (Palinchak, 1973).

Texas

Texas community colleges grew "without plan or pattern" prior to 1965 (Palinchak, 1973, p. 88), when legislation and the master plan put them under the same control as other higher education institutions in the state. State appropriations are provided for educational and general operations, while local support is used for maintenance and management of the buildings and grounds. The Community Colleges and Technical Institutes Division served as the coordinating agent for two-year postsecondary education in the state of Texas. It included 69 community and junior college districts comprised of 66 individual institutions in addition to four campuses and two centers of the Texas Technical Institute and Lamar University of Orange and Port Arthur. Texas legislature passed a mandate in 1965 to "provide leadership and

coordination for the Texas higher education system, and institutions and governing board, to the end that the state of Texas may achieve excellence for college education of its youth through the efficient and effective utilization and concentration of all available resources and the elimination of costly duplication in program offerings, facilities and physical plants" (quoted in Fountain & Tollefson, 1989, pp. 220-221). This was intended to bring order to rapid growth by increasing access to higher education. State control and direction was necessary to give some coordination to the local demand for two-year higher education. With an emphasis on technical education their goal was to work in tandem with the private sector to provide a skilled work force ready to work in an ever-changing technical environment. Appointed by the governor, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board is responsible for control and coordination of public postsecondary institutions and the coordination of the master plan. This includes approval of both degree programs and off-campus activities. They also define formulas for budget appropriations, run elections to create junior college districts, and manage issues surrounding the establishment of new junior colleges. Building repair and construction also fall under their jurisdiction. Institutional governing boards oversee either one or more individual institutions in Texas' 49 public community/junior college districts and one technical institute (McGuinness & Paulson, 1990). Texas has designed 2+2+2 programs to facilitate easy movement in technical areas from a foundation at a high school, to an associate degree preparing the student for work as a technician, or to move to a four-year institution where another two years are further preparation for more advanced positions (Fountain & Tollefson, 1989).

Texas operates 69 community college districts with a coordinating board in charge of formulas for budget appropriations, the creation of new institutions, and the construction and repair of buildings. Unlike Pennsylvania whose community colleges negotiate articulation agreements with individual four-year institutions, Texas operates a well-defined 2+2+2 educational system. Texas community colleges grew and coordination was defined about the same time (the early 1970s) as the Pennsylvania Act.

Florida

The Board of Regents of the State University System and the State Board of Community Colleges operate under the State Board of Education in Florida. This board is comprised of seven persons designated by virtue of their position within the state. Established in 1885, the State Board of Education is responsible for budget decisions and recommendations. (McGuinness & Paulson, 1990).

In 1927, the first junior college in Florida was established at St. Petersburg. It was a private institution. A public junior college was founded at Palm Beach in 1933. State support was given to these institutions with the Omnibus School Bill, passed in 1947 allowing local support for junior colleges as well as elementary and secondary schools (Palinchak, 1973). Florida's organized system of community colleges began in 1955 with the establishment of the Community College Council. In 1957 a recommendation of a formal system of two-year colleges was made in the form of a master plan, becoming a national model for organized community college development (McGuinness & Paulson, 1990). The Florida Legislature, in 1961, created a Junior

College Board "to coordinate statewide growth of these institutions with the help of the Division of Community Junior Colleges in the State Department of Education (Palinchak, 1973, p. 84). The institutions formed were operated by local districts and governed by local boards separate from the secondary school boards.

The State Board of Community Colleges was established in 1983 and is responsible to these 28 public community colleges in the state of Florida (McGuinness & Paulson, 1990). Florida also earned national acclaim because of its balance between local and state control. To keep up with changes in student demographics, a second master plan, issued in the early 1980s, gave further guidance. Florida's community colleges offer services in four areas: 1) a parallel program of liberal arts enabling transfer to the state universities, 2) occupational and technical education, 3) continuing education and community service, and 4) college preparatory courses (Fountain & Tollefson, 1989).

Florida has a longer history in two-year postsecondary education than Pennsylvania. These colleges are operated under a single State Board of Education and are overseen by the Community College Council, enabling them to operate as a coordinated system unlike the community colleges in Pennsylvania. Like Pennsylvania, the Florida community colleges report to the Chief State School Officer and are organized under the Department of Education.

Illinois

Illinois claims the same four missions as Florida. This state operates 39 public community college districts comprised of 50 colleges and five branches. The 1970

Constitution of Illinois sets as a goal the education of all citizens to the extent of their capabilities. The statewide community college system is one way to reach this goal. Boasting the first public junior college in the nation, Joliet Junior College --- chartered in 1901--- Illinois was also a leader in community college planning. State legislation in 1931 gave authority to the Board of Education of Chicago for establishing and maintaining a junior college to serve the citizens of the city. The first Junior College Act in 1937 established junior colleges as part of the public school system. State funding was given in 1955, opening the doors of seven additional colleges and bringing the total in 1962 to 18.

The Board of Higher Education was developed in 1963 "to coordinate what had already happened" in Illinois (Palinchak, 1973). The master plan for Illinois was published in 1964, and the Junior College Bill was authorized in 1965, authorizing junior colleges as part of higher education. Currently public community colleges in Illinois operate with a ⅓ - ⅓ - ⅓ split of financial support coming from local sources in the form of property taxes, student tuition and fees, and State appropriations (Fountain & Tollefson, 1989, p. 65), similar to the financial arrangement for community college operation in Pennsylvania. The system came into being at approximately the same time as the passage of the Community College Act in Pennsylvania.

The Board of Higher Education in Illinois is also an appointed board, established in 1961 and charged with the planning and coordination of all postsecondary institutions including vocational/technical and proprietary institutions. This board reviews budget issues: approves new institutions, campuses, and programs; and is

responsible for the development and implementation of the statewide master plan. A Community College Board serves the 39 state community colleges, while state universities are served by other boards of regents and trustees (McGuinness & Paulson, 1990).

Illinois, Florida, and Pennsylvania all claim the same missions, but the Illinois system also differs from Pennsylvania. Illinois has a longer history in two-year higher education than Pennsylvania with the first Junior College --- Joliet, established in 1901 --- and operates a greater number of community colleges under a single Community College Board.

Ohio

Ohio boasts a community college system geographically dispersed and within commuting distance of every state resident. This system consists of five community colleges, two state community colleges, 16 technical colleges, four urban technical centers, and the 26 branch campuses of universities (Fountain & Tollefson, 1989, p. 167). Ohio began examining two-year postsecondary education in 1961 with recommendations which included the establishment of community and technical schools as well as the facilitation of branch campuses.

An attempt to establish community colleges was vetoed by the governor due to lack of funds in 1959. Attempted again in 1961, the bill was once more defeated, but a bill calling for technical institutes was advanced. In 1963, a bill written to offer technical and occupational subjects in an institution called a community college was passed paving the way for two-year postsecondary education in Ohio (Palinchak, 1973).

Established in 1963, the Board of Regents in Ohio is an appointed board responsible for the coordination of public and private postsecondary institutions as well as community and technical colleges. This group reviews budgets and approves programs. They work with numerous institutional governing boards from community and technical colleges, state university boards, and governing bodies representing medical schools (McGuinness & Paulson, 1990). In 1969 legislation was passed that mandated all postsecondary technical education be under the jurisdiction of the Ohio Board of Regents and operate from an institution of higher education (Fountain & Tollefson, 1989).

Ohio's collection of community colleges, technical colleges, technical centers, and university branch campuses is more similar to Pennsylvania's arrangement than the other states included in this study. Unlike Pennsylvania, Ohio's two-year postsecondary institutions are planned to be geographically dispersed and within commuting distance of all Ohio residents. Pennsylvania cannot make this claim.

Michigan

Michigan also planned access for geographical purposes. The goal was to provide a community college within 40 miles of state residents. Beginning with the founding of Grand Rapids College in 1914 (Palinchak, 1973), Michigan has developed a system comprised of 29 comprehensive community and junior colleges. The four program areas of transfer, technical, remedial, and continuing education are complimented with additional expectations in student services, community development, and business and industry (Fountain & Tollefson, 1989). The State

Board of Education in Michigan oversees elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education by coordinating services, making and following policy recommendations about budget and program issues, serving as a licensing agency for vocational/technical and proprietary schools, and implementing the master plan. This board is elected. Serving in an advisory capacity to this board is the Community College Board. Each of the 29 public community colleges have their own elected governing boards. Other institutional governing boards include boards of trustees for state universities (McGuinness & Paulson, 1990). Michigan Legislature passed Act 237 of the Public Acts of 1964, giving community colleges permission to teach collegiate and non-collegiate programs, easing the time limits these programs may require, and encouraging response of these institutions to local needs (Palinchak, 1973).

Michigan also claims geographical access and a greater number of comprehensive community and junior colleges than does Pennsylvania. Their Community College Board works closely with both secondary schools and state universities to coordinate services. Like Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Florida they claim transfer, technical, remedial, and continuing education as their missions --- adding to that student services, community development, and coordination with business and industry.

PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania has a number of community colleges, and a number of university

branch campuses, but these are not strategically located in terms of geography or population to provide access as in the case of states mentioned above. They do not necessarily work well in conjunction with one another. Palinchak uses one example to illustrate this point: "in northeastern Pennsylvania, where one community college was recommended, three two-year colleges appeared. Political encounters between two adjacent counties and the dominance of the State university produced three independent, public two-year colleges within several miles of each other" (p. 145). The legislature did aid in the establishment of community colleges in Pennsylvania, but a simple system did not emerge as a result.

Pennsylvania's governing agency is the State Board of Education, an appointed group created in 1963 which is a departmental board of the State Department of Education. It is divided into two councils: the Council of Basic Education and the Council of Higher Education. The Council of Higher Education coordinates and plans for all of the postsecondary education in Pennsylvania "consisting of the State System of Higher Education comprised of 14 state universities and branch campuses of Clarion, Edinboro, and Indiana University of PA; 4 state-related universities with 25 branch campuses and one affiliated college; 13 community colleges; 116 independent colleges and universities, including 9 junior colleges and 11 state-aided institutions; and 90 specialized associate degree-granting institutions, including 1 state school of technology" (McGuiness & Paulson, 1990, p 206). The State System of Higher Education is governed by its own Board of Governors, and each individual institution

has a Board of Trustees. The Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities represents 117 institutions, both public and private (McGuinness & Paulson, 1990).

Pennsylvania's two-year schools did not begin with the Community College Act of 1963. The Pennsylvania State University, The University of Pittsburgh, Temple University, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Clarion University, and Edinboro University had branches offering the first two years of college instruction prior to 1963 (Heald, Hobson & Associates, 1968). The Pennsylvania State University began the Allentown Center in 1912 (Heald, Hobson, & Associates, 1968), and The University of Pittsburgh established an off-campus center working with the school district of Johnstown in 1927 (Sack, 1963). Palinchak (1973), claims that community colleges in Pennsylvania faced opposition to their establishment from the beginning "because of vested interests in the quasi-public State university and its system of eighteen campus centers" (p. 86).

Other forms of two-year education existed early on in Pennsylvania. Identified as academies, seminaries, and elongated secondary schools, institutions existed in the nineteenth century predating early junior colleges. There were institutions operating in Pennsylvania as junior colleges as early as 1858 (Sack, 1963). Susquehana University, then known as the Missionary Institute of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, began operations in Pennsylvania in 1858 offering opportunities for students to "prepare themselves for the Junior and Senior Classes of College," (Sack, 1963, p. 595). No degree was awarded after the completion of these first two years, however. Palatinate College was founded by the Lebanon Classis of the German Reformed

Church in 1868 and was a feeder school for Franklin and Marshall College. Palatinate prepared students for entrance to the Junior class of college in addition to preparing students for business or teaching occupations. One institution fitting the description of a "municipal junior college" opened in 1938 in Hershey, Pennsylvania. Mr. Milton S. Hershey, a supporter of youth and of education, was the benefactor (Klotz, 1970).

Not all branch campuses began as branches to specific colleges or universities or junior colleges. The Pennsylvania State University branch in Mont Alto, for instance, was originally an independent forestry school. Some four year schools originally offered two-year degree programs. The "normal course" offered in 1857 at Millersville State Normal School accepted "students with a *fair* knowledge of the branches of study required by law to be taught in Common Schools, can enter this course and graduate in two years" (Sack, 1963, p. 543).

Sack, in 1963, reports that the branch campuses at institutions other than the Pennsylvania State University were having trouble continuing their operations. Junior colleges that were not branch campuses were more and more often merging with four-year institutions or simply closing their doors. Sack stated, "If no new ones arise to fill the widening gap, the future of the junior college movement in Pennsylvania is at best static" (p. 602).

Many groups were interested in two-year education but had diverse points of view and could not reach any compromise. In "A Report to the State Board of Education," by Ralph R. Fields and Associates (1965) one section is devoted to the "relationship of community colleges to other educational institutions in the state," which

shows concern by the members of the Council of Higher Education who were working on the implementation of the Community College Act of 1963 (p. 51). This report specifically mentions the Pennsylvania Sate University, saying that certain assumptions about the educational roles of the University are necessary in order to understand the relationship of Penn State to the community college. Urging the University to differentiate itself and its campuses from the community college idea, the report stated: "for the University, it would appear advantageous to address itself primarily to those functions which are characteristic of the great state universities of our lands," (Fields & Associates, 1965, p. 52). Although there were many colleges and universities in Pennsylvania during the early 1960s, the concern echoed throughout this report appears to have centered on The Pennsylvania State University and its perceived empire building (Heald, Hobson, & Associates, 1968).

The central state body was to stimulate the establishment of new community colleges and assure their geographic placement in locations without colleges offering duplicate instruction and with the population to support the new institutions. These institutions were to be independent and autonomous, reporting to their own Board of Trustees, but the state was to assume the task of training individuals how to be trustees through conferences and creating opportunities for the trustees to come together. The community colleges were to be coordinated under the state's entire system of higher education, and were to collaborate with the Vocational Bureau on the State Vocational Plan. Communities which wanted to establish a community college were to follow the

standards, rules, and regulations in the application proposal submitted to the State Board of Education (Fields & associates, 1965).

In Yarrington's 1969 comprehensive collection of state updates on two-year colleges, A. Martin Eldersveld reported a dismal 33 per cent of the state's high school graduates entering college, and a ranking of 49th in the nation in expenditure per capita for postsecondary institutions prior to the Community College Act (p. 150). The Governor's Committee of One Hundred for Better Education identified approximately 20,000 public school graduates as potential enrollees for Pennsylvania community colleges each year (p. 151). After the Community College Act was passed, the State Board of Education authorized the preparation of master plans intended "to define the roles of existing institutions, to outline the needs of the future, and hence provide the necessary guidelines for an urgent reorganization" (Eldersveld, 1969, p. 155). The plan for community colleges included a service-area boundary plan arranged around 28 districts benefiting the entire state (Bender & Shoemaker, 1971; Eldersveld, 1969; Witt, Wattenbarger, Gollattscheck, & Suppiger, 1994). The state expected this master plan to result in a statewide program, but this coordination did not materialize.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND SCOPE OF STUDY

Five of the first community colleges approved in the state were Harrisburg Area Community College in Dauphin County (opened in 1964), Community College of Philadelphia (1965), Bucks County Community College (1965), Montgomery County Community College (1966), and Butler County Community College (1966). These

counties represent the central region and state capital of Pennsylvania, the urban and suburban Philadelphia area in the eastern part of the state, and a rural area in the western part of the state. They offer a geographical representation of Pennsylvania as well as illustrating the earliest beginnings of Pennsylvania community colleges. Archival data from these institutions and the communities where they are located offer further clarification of how and why a system did not develop.

According to Goodwin (1971), an educational history deals "with assumptions, concepts, constructs, and patterns of thought" (p. 12). This paper will analyze these assumptions, concepts, constructs, and patterns in relation to their effect on the first colleges in Pennsylvania. Ratcliff (1987) lists three obstacles to the establishment of the first public junior colleges.

> In most states, the first locally supported, public two-year college faced certain obstacles to establishment and organization that were unique. First, the support of various interest groups within the municipalities had to be developed and marshalled. Second, the support necessary for the passage of state legislation to enable the establishment of two-year colleges had to be garnered. Third, relations needed to be established with neighboring four-year institutions to enable students to transfer credits earned at the new college (p. 152).

These obstacles are evidenced in Pennsylvania, here not as much in the development of any one junior or community college, but in their interplay throughout the entire state and the failure to establish one system of two-year postsecondary education.

FINDINGS IN SELECTED COMMUNITIES

Each of the following communities overcame their individual and unique

obstacles and illustrate the development of early community colleges on a micro level. In combination, these examples embody the same obstacles on a macro scale, as well as depict the interplay between them.

Harrisburg Area Community College

This first comprehensive community college to open in Pennsylvania was sponsored by 61 public school districts in three counties (Harrisburg Area Community College, 1967-1968). In the 1960s, Harrisburg was one of the few state capitols without some sort of college. The Harrisburg Board of School Directors began studying and planning when the 1963 legislature neared agreement (Harrisburg Area Community College, 1964). While school districts signed on as sponsors; questionnaires were sent to students, parents, leaders in business and industry, school guidance counselors, and area higher education institutions. Survey results were part of the application process of every potential sponsor to the state, but the information disseminated and the interest generated served another function. The community's interest in the two-year school grew. High school students made plans to attend. Business leaders discussed their training needs. The City of Harrisburg donated 150 acres of land (Harrisburg Area Community College, 1964). The Harrisburg supporters worked together at a terrific pace in order to open by September of 1964 (Program for the Dedication, 1964).

The state application procedure specified the involvement of local higher education institutions. Supposedly, asking nearby colleges and universities to help in an advisory role would assure their support. The colleges in the Harrisburg area

indicated they would cooperate and accept the products of the new community college with no preconceived negative bias. These institutions expressed their understanding that a need existed for the new type of institution ("Progress report," 1963).

The Higher Education Facilities Act authorized 1.5 million dollars in federal funds for construction expenses and Harrisburg wanted it. A brochure distributed to area citizens explained the need for matching funds and the need for haste. The Pennsylvania State University competed for these funds, claiming that the branch campuses formed in the mid-1960s were meeting the needs of the Commonwealth for two-year education and therefore deserved the capital improvement. ("HACC officials," 1965).

Community College of Philadelphia

Philadelphia is a large urban area, often modeling itself after New York City. The idea of two-year postsecondary education was no exception (Bonnell, 1984). Philadelphia's serious interest in establishing a college began in 1955 when City Council formed the Committee on Higher Educational Opportunities to examine the needs of the area. This group advanced the idea of a city-sponsored two-year community college, similar to the "free city colleges" in New York which had been in operation since 1847 (Community College of Philadelphia, 1966-1967).

When it became obvious that legislation permitting this city college idea would not be successful, Philadelphia marshalled its efforts and applied for a community college under city sponsorship. The search for a site began prior to the passage of the Community College Act. Ultimately, the City of Philadelphia wanted a college to serve

the needs of the community "sensitive to the needs of Philadelphia: the needs of commerce and industry and the professions for productive personnel; the needs of the body politic for an informed citizenry; the needs of people and colleges and all walks of life for a level of training that would prepare them for living and making a living in a modern, urban, industrial society" (Bonnell, 1984, p. 351).

Bucks County Community College

Interest began in 1961 with an group of Bucks County citizens who wanted to see the expansion of higher education in their county. The community was interested, but the state was slow in its support. This community college was established on what is described as a baronial estate. This estate was left to Temple University in 1963 and intended for educational purposes. The trustees of Temple had no use for the property and sold it in 1965 to Bucks County for their new community college (Bender, L. W. & Eitzen, M., 1966). Surveys here also showed high interest among students, parents, adults, business and industry leaders, and local professionals ("Preliminary proposal," 1964).

Bucks chose the county sponsorship model to assure a uniform taxing base, operate only one central budgeting office, and offer equal opportunity for all citizens of the county ("Preliminary proposal," 1964, p. 61). Financial concerns abounded. Commissioners approved of the idea of a community college, but were leery of the role of sponsor and the debt inherent in such a commitment ("Two favor," 1964).

Montgomery County Community College

The minutes from the first meeting of the Montgomery County Community

College Board (Montgomery County Community College Board of Trustees, 1965), emphasized that the establishment of community colleges was not mandated by the federal or state government. It was, however, what the people of the county appeared to want. The majority of the population appeared to believe in this project. Town meetings were held in various locations where approval from citizens was almost unanimous (Community College Advising Committee, 1964). Soon the site committee was discussing negotiations for a nearby property owned by Temple University.

One particular individual did not approve. A taxpayer sued the newly established Board, challenging a section of the Act which said sponsors were bound by the acts of the trustees (Mild, 1985; Montgomery County Community College, 1969). What was meant as a way for trustees to spend money on small purchases without constantly asking permission -- instead gave them freedom to incur all the debt they wanted (Mild, 1985). Due to this suit, Montgomery lost not only a year of valuable planning time, but their choice of locations. Temple University had second thoughts after the lawsuit was settled and kept the property Montgomery County Community College had planned to purchase, later opening Temple's Ambler campus (Reilly, 1991).

Butler County Community College

In November, 1958, two things happened in Butler County that moved it toward a community college. A group of school directors developed an interest in establishing a technical high school, and 100 business and industry leaders organized to improve education in the county. An entire page was published in the local newspaper,

informing the public of the plan to open a community college. The public response was quite favorable. Nearby colleges and universities were asked if the would be willing to assist in the establishment of the new two-year school. Nearly all of the institutions surveyed agreed to accept credits from the new community college; two colleges said they would do whatever the Pennsylvania State University did. Invitations were extended to school districts contiguous to Butler County but located in counties without community colleges. None of these districts expressed an interest in the Butler project, even though they had nothing similar to offer their graduates (Proposed Plan for Butler County Community College, 1965).

In September of 1965, a taxpayer from Butler County brought suit against the County Commissioners, their collecting taxes for the community college, and specifically challenging the constitutionality of the project. The filing had been followed by a continuance until the passage of new legislation designed to correct the alleged defects. Tax collections were to be held in escrow under this court ruling (Butler County Community College Board of Trustees, 1965). This did not stop progress in Butler.

> The members of the Board of Trustees believed so strongly in the merit of their position that, as individuals, they were willing to pledge their personal assets as collateral in order to secure loans to provide temporary funds for planning purposes and to meet commitments already entered into in good faith. An "open letter" to the people of Butler County was published explaining their financial position and the reasons why they could not wait until the hearing and the Judgement of the Court to continue with the college plans (Rose, 1983, p. 32).

The community college opened successfully in Butler within one year of the lawsuit.

CONCLUSION

In Pennsylvania, the support of interest groups within school districts, cities, and counties was successfully marshalled. In all five of the communities visited, the school directors, business and industry owners, local professionals, and citizens felt strongly about the community college idea. The Butler trustees risked their own assets (Rose, 1983, p.32), and citizens in Harrisburg donated $425,000. to earn matching funds for their new institution (Harrisburg Area Community College, 1964). The enlistment of local support may have been done "too well!" Exceptional local identification and regard overshadowed the development of a "state pride" among Pennsylvanians. This local mentality led Philadelphia to push for the free city college model and encouraged rural areas to campaign for a California-like model --- the upward extension of high schools (Bonnell, 1984, p. 4). Students were not encouraged to attend community colleges outside of their service area (Proposed Plan for Butler County Community College, 1965). Legislators representing their constituents in these areas argued their ideas and opinions. These interests divided the state, thus postponing enabling legislation in Pennsylvania.

This local mentality is further evidenced in lawsuits filed by two taxpayers in two separate counties. Neither of these citizens of Pennsylvania, although concerned about the constitutionality of the Act itself, filed their suits against the state! Both legal complaints focused on individual counties.

Relations with neighboring institutions, although not overtly hostile, were confusing. Temple University, for instance, sold an estate meant for educational

purposes, to Bucks County. Montgomery County had planned a similar arrangement before their lawsuit, but once legal matters were settled Temple had made arrangements to establish its own branch campus on the piece of property in question.

The Pennsylvania State University insisted it filled a niche separate from that of the new community college, and yet this University was not bashful about competition when Harrisburg applied for construction funds. Officials from Harrisburg Area Community College charged Penn State with "regrettable" efforts to obstruct a grant of 1.5 million dollars and called the University an "octopus" ("HACC officials," 1965). The Fields and Associates report about community colleges in Pennsylvania (1965), the Heald, Hobson, and Associates study on Pennsylvania's off-campus centers (1968), and the report from the Academy for Educational Development on the elements of a master plan for Pennsylvania (1965) all mention the unusual dynamics of the two-year extension and off-campus ventures operating in Pennsylvania --- especially those of The Pennsylvania State University.

So while Pennsylvania enjoyed local support for community colleges, passed legislation enabling the same, and had a plethora of four-year institutions willing to accept transfer students; system development was complicated by the "extreme" manifestation of local pride, delays in legislation, and the peculiar case of branch campuses. With the passage of the 1963 Act came hope for a statewide system. The master plan adopted by the Pennsylvania Board of Education called for 28 community college districts (Bender & Shoemaker, 1971; Eldersveld, 1969; Witt, Wattenbarger, Gollattscheck, & Suppiger, 1994). These did not materialize. Legislation was not

enough to bring the Pennsylvania system to fruition. The social climate of the state played a big part within the individual counties and service areas, as well as in the development and success of the legislation itself.

Although each state has its own way of coordinating two-year postsecondary education; and all have their individual histories, methods of funding, and governance; Pennsylvania appears to stand out as the most deviant "non-system" of the eight largest states. Currently the commonwealth campus system of The Pennsylvania State University is undergoing changes due in part to the changing nature of two-year postsecondary education and the needs of the citizens of the state. Community colleges are negotiating articulation agreements with four-year institutions while simultaneously bargaining with local business and industry leaders, hoping to maintain collegiate status and sustained enrollment; as well as lobbying for an increase in financial support from the state. Perhaps an understanding of the past will help direct the future of two-year higher education providers in Pennsylvania.

REFERENCES

Academy for Educational Development. (1965, December). Elements of a master plan for higher education in Pennsylvania: A report to the State Board of Education of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. New York: Academy for Educational Development.

Bender, L. W. (1994) State Articulation Policies: Myths and reality. In James L. Ratcliff (Ed.), ASHE Reader in community colleges (2nd ed., pp. 165-182). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Bender, L. W., & Eitzen, M. (July, 1966). Commissioner's coup: First county community college. Bucks County Life, 8 (5), 12-13, 24.

Bender, L. W., & Shoemaker, E. A. (1971). Miracles do happen: The Pennsylvania community colleges. Junior College Journal, 42 (1), 10-13.

Bonnell, A. T. (1984). Community College of Philadelphia: A chronicle of the years 1964-1984. Philadelphia: Community College of Philadelphia.

Butler County Community College Board of Trustees. Board meeting minutes. (October 15, 1965).

Callen, P., Bracco, K. R., Finney, J., Martinez, M., Penley, Y., & Richardson, R. (1996, October). Linking research to public policy discussions of state governance and finance. Handout prepared for The Association for the Study of Higher Education conference, Memphis, Tennessee.

Cohen, A. M. (1996, October). Speech presented at CUC Board meeting: The Association for the Study of Higher Education conference, Memphis, Tennessee.

Community College Advising Committee. (1964). Community college plan for the Community College of Montgomery County. Montgomery County Community College archives.

Community College of Philadelphia. (1966-1967). Bulletin, 1 (1). Philadelphia, PA: Author.

Eldersveld, A. M. (1969). Pennsylvania opens the door. In R. Yarrington (Ed.), Junior colleges: 50 states/50 years (pp. 150-158).

Fields, R. R. & Associates. (1965, June). Community Colleges in Pennsylvania: A report to the state board of education. Harrisburg, PA: State Board of Education Press.

Fountain, B. E. & Tollefson, T. A. (1989). Community colleges in the United States: Forty-nine state systems. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Goodwin, G. L. (1971). "The historical development of the community-junior college ideology: An analysis and interpretation of the writing of selected community-junior college national leaders from 1890 to 1970." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

HACC officials regret PSU bid to block funds. (1965, June 17). Evening News, p. 1.

Harrisburg Area Community College. (1964). From dream to reality...with your help. [Brochure]. Harrisburg, PA: Author.

Harrisburg Area Community College. (1967-1968). Catalog. Harrisburg, PA: Author.

Heald, Hobson, & Associates. (1968, March). Off-campus centers in Pennsylvania. Harrisburg, PA: State Board of Education Press.

Klotz, R. R. (1970). "The Hershey Junior College, Hershey, Pennsylvania 1938-1965." D.Ed. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

McGuiness, A., & Paulson, C. (1990). State postsecondary education structures handbook, 1991: State coordinating and governing boards. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Mild, W. (1985). Transcripts of taped interviews regarding the founding of Montgomery County Community College. Blue Bell, Pennsylvania: Montgomery County Community College.

Montgomery County Community College. (October, 1969). Evaluation report of Montgomery County Community College for the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Blue Bell, PA: Author.

Montgomery County Community College Board of Trustees. Board meeting minutes. (January 5, 1965). Montgomery County Community College archives.

Palinchak, R. (1973). The evolution of the community college. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Preliminary proposal for Bucks County Community College: A forward look. (May, 1964). Bucks County Community College archives, #261.

Program for the dedication. (October 15, 1964). Harrisburg Area Community College archives.

Progress report of the special committee and the citizens advisory committees for public community college as authorized by the commonwealth of Pennsylvania. (October 22, 1963). Harrisburg Area Community College archives.

Proposed plan for Butler County Community College: Prepared under the direction of the Board of Commissioners of Butler County. (January, 1965). Butler County Community College archives.

Ratcliff, J. L. (1987). "First" public junior colleges in an age of reform. Journal of Higher Education, 58 (2), 151-180.

Reid, A. E. Jr. (1966). "A history of the California public junior college movement." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California.

Reilly, C. E. (1991). "Ah Monto, what a place!: An oral history of Montgomery County Community College. Blue Bell, PA: Montgomery County Community College.

Rose, D. L. (1983). The establishment of the Butler County Community College: A race with time. Unpublished manuscript, Butler County Community College.

Sack, S. (1963). History of higher education in Pennsylvania. Harrisburg, PA: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Two favor college plan. (1964, March 10). Courier Times, p. 8.

Witt, A. A., Wattenbarger, J. L., Gollattscheck, J. F., & Suppiger, J. E. (1994). America's community colleges: The first century. Washington, DC: the American Association of Community College.